

Supreme Court Hearings for Judge Roberts



The Kind of Judge America Needs

- A fair, independent and unbiased judge committed to equal justice under the law.
- Strictly interprets the law and does not legislate from the bench.
- Decides each case based on the facts and the law, not on personal political views.

Brilliant, Distinguished, Eminently Qualified

- Unanimously confirmed only two years ago for the D.C. Circuit.
- Earned ABA's highest rating - unanimous "well qualified."
- *Summa cum laude* from Harvard in 3 years, *magna cum laude* from Harvard Law.
- Regarded as one of the nation's finest Supreme Court advocates, argued 39 cases before the Court.

Deserves a Fair Hearing, Timely Up-or-Down Vote

- Judge Roberts's record has been reviewed more extensively than any previous Supreme Court nominee.
- Senators should ensure Judge Roberts receives a fair, respectful hearing.
- Senators should not attempt to politicize the judicial confirmation process.
- Judge Roberts deserves an up-or-down confirmation vote before October 1.

Supreme Court Hearings for Judge Roberts



The Kind of Judge America Needs

- A fair, independent and unbiased judge committed to equal justice under the law.
- Strictly interprets the law and does not legislate from the bench.
- Decides each case based on the facts and the law, not on personal political views.

Brilliant, Distinguished, Eminently Qualified

- Unanimously confirmed only two years ago for the D.C. Circuit.
- Earned ABA's highest rating - unanimous "well qualified."
- *Summa cum laude* from Harvard in 3 years, *magna cum laude* from Harvard Law.
- Regarded as one of the nation's finest Supreme Court advocates, argued 39 cases before the Court.

Deserves a Fair Hearing, Timely Up-or-Down Vote

- Judge Roberts's record has been reviewed more extensively than any previous Supreme Court nominee.
- Senators should ensure Judge Roberts receives a fair, respectful hearing.
- Senators should not attempt to politicize the judicial confirmation process.
- Judge Roberts deserves an up-or-down confirmation vote before October 1.

Supreme Court Hearings for Judge Roberts



The Kind of Judge America Needs

- A fair, independent and unbiased judge committed to equal justice under the law.
- Strictly interprets the law and does not legislate from the bench.
- Decides each case based on the facts and the law, not on personal political views.

Brilliant, Distinguished, Eminently Qualified

- Unanimously confirmed only two years ago for the D.C. Circuit.
- Earned ABA's highest rating - unanimous "well qualified."
- *Summa cum laude* from Harvard in 3 years, *magna cum laude* from Harvard Law.
- Regarded as one of the nation's finest Supreme Court advocates, argued 39 cases before the Court.

Deserves a Fair Hearing, Timely Up-or-Down Vote

- Judge Roberts's record has been reviewed more extensively than any previous Supreme Court nominee.
- Senators should ensure Judge Roberts receives a fair, respectful hearing.
- Senators should not attempt to politicize the judicial confirmation process.
- Judge Roberts deserves an up-or-down confirmation vote before October 1.

Supreme Court Confirmation Process



The Ginsburg Standard should apply to all Supreme Court nominations - fair, dignified hearings and a timely, up-or-down vote.

- The President has the power and the right to nominate qualified persons of his choice - Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg's position with the ACLU and controversial ideological statements were not disqualifiers.
- As Chairman Biden counseled Ginsburg, specific issues likely to come before the Supreme Court should not be discussed - Ginsburg declined to answer Senators' questions 55 times on such issues.
- The process should be respectful and expeditious - the Senate confirmed Ginsburg overwhelmingly 42 days after her nomination following 4 days of respectful hearings and 2 days of floor debate.

Senators should have access to appropriate information sufficient to make an informed decision on the nominee.

- Senators have received ample info to discern the nominee's judicial philosophy and legal ability.
- Documents have been delivered promptly following a careful review process.
- Endless requests for more documents are merely part of a partisan strategy to delay and obstruct the nomination.

Judges are not politicians. The Senate debate should reflect that the job of a judge is to review cases impartially, not to advocate issues.

- Nominees should never compromise their independence and ability to rule fairly by pre-judging cases or advocating positions on issues that could come before them on the bench.
- It is appropriate to discuss a nominee's judicial philosophy; i.e., the nominee's broad legal thinking and views on a judge's role within our constitutional framework.
- It is not appropriate to require a nominee to discuss specific cases or issue positions.

Supreme Court Confirmation Process



The Ginsburg Standard should apply to all Supreme Court nominations - fair, dignified hearings and a timely, up-or-down vote.

- The President has the power and the right to nominate qualified persons of his choice - Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg's position with the ACLU and controversial ideological statements were not disqualifiers.
- As Chairman Biden counseled Ginsburg, specific issues likely to come before the Supreme Court should not be discussed - Ginsburg declined to answer Senators' questions 55 times on such issues.
- The process should be respectful and expeditious - the Senate confirmed Ginsburg overwhelmingly 42 days after her nomination following 4 days of respectful hearings and 2 days of floor debate.

Senators should have access to appropriate information sufficient to make an informed decision on the nominee.

- Senators have received ample info to discern the nominee's judicial philosophy and legal ability.
- Documents have been delivered promptly following a careful review process.
- Endless requests for more documents are merely part of a partisan strategy to delay and obstruct the nomination.

Judges are not politicians. The Senate debate should reflect that the job of a judge is to review cases impartially, not to advocate issues.

- Nominees should never compromise their independence and ability to rule fairly by pre-judging cases or advocating positions on issues that could come before them on the bench.
- It is appropriate to discuss a nominee's judicial philosophy; i.e., the nominee's broad legal thinking and views on a judge's role within our constitutional framework.
- It is not appropriate to require a nominee to discuss specific cases or issue positions.

Supreme Court Confirmation Process



The Ginsburg Standard should apply to all Supreme Court nominations - fair, dignified hearings and a timely, up-or-down vote.

- The President has the power and the right to nominate qualified persons of his choice - Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg's position with the ACLU and controversial ideological statements were not disqualifiers.
- As Chairman Biden counseled Ginsburg, specific issues likely to come before the Supreme Court should not be discussed - Ginsburg declined to answer Senators' questions 55 times on such issues.
- The process should be respectful and expeditious - the Senate confirmed Ginsburg overwhelmingly 42 days after her nomination following 4 days of respectful hearings and 2 days of floor debate.

Senators should have access to appropriate information sufficient to make an informed decision on the nominee.

- Senators have received ample info to discern the nominee's judicial philosophy and legal ability.
- Documents have been delivered promptly following a careful review process.
- Endless requests for more documents are merely part of a partisan strategy to delay and obstruct the nomination.

Judges are not politicians. The Senate debate should reflect that the job of a judge is to review cases impartially, not to advocate issues.

- Nominees should never compromise their independence and ability to rule fairly by pre-judging cases or advocating positions on issues that could come before them on the bench.
- It is appropriate to discuss a nominee's judicial philosophy; i.e., the nominee's broad legal thinking and views on a judge's role within our constitutional framework.
- It is not appropriate to require a nominee to discuss specific cases or issue positions.